

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

-----  
OLIVER A. PENTINMAKI, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Warden DEIDRE MORGAN,  
Security Director THELEN,  
Captain SPROELICH, Captain BUETTNER,  
Lt. ALBERTS, Sgt. KELLY, Sgt. HAVENS,  
Officer PAYNE, DEBRA LANCE,  
Dr. EUGENE WALL, Dr. JANET WALSH,  
Warden (Director) BYRAN BARTOW,  
Deputy Director THOMAS SPEECH,  
SCOTT BOEVERS, THERESA BARWELL,  
STEVE SPANBAUER, Dr. GANNON and  
RICK RAEMISCH,

Defendants.  
-----

ORDER

10-cv-194-slc<sup>1</sup>

On June 8, 2010, I directed plaintiff to inform the court whether he wished to proceed on his excessive force claim against defendants Alberts and Payne and dismiss his remaining claims or file an amended complaint limited to one set of defendants and one set of occurrences, as required under Fed. R. Civ. P. 20.

On June 11, 2010, plaintiff filed three new complaints further detailing the claims not

---

<sup>1</sup> Because consents to the magistrate judge's jurisdiction have not yet been filed by all the parties to this action, I am assuming jurisdiction over the case for the purpose of this order.

relating to his excessive force claim, dkt. ## 17, 18 and 19. Also, plaintiff responded to the June 8 order in a letter, dkt. #20, saying that he wishes to pursue his claim against defendants Alberts and Payne and that the new complaints he filed are “separate from the submission that will be forthcoming as a result of this latest June 8 order.” Therefore, I will sever the proposed complaints from the present case as follows: The proposed complaint, dkt #17, against defendants Morgan, Thelen, Sproelich, Buettner, Winchell, Alberts, Kelly, Havens, Lance and Walsh is assigned case no. 10-cv-325-slc. The proposed complaint, dkt. #18, against defendants Morgan, Thelen, Sproelich, Buettner, Winchell, Alberts, Kelly, Havens, Lance, Walsh and Wall is assigned case no. 10-cv-326-slc, and the proposed complaint, dkt #19, against defendants Speech, Boevers, Schertz, Collier, Gable, Barwell and Spanbauer is assigned case no. 10-cv-327-slc.

Finally, plaintiff has filed a fourth new complaint that seems to be what he was referring to as “the submission that will be forthcoming as a result of” the court’s June 8 order. I will docket that complaint in case no. 10-cv-337-slc. The present case, now containing only plaintiff’s excessive force claim against defendants Alberts and Payne, will be taken under advisement for screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

#### ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that

1. Plaintiff Oliver A. Pentinmaki, Jr.’s proposed complaints filed on June 11, 2010, dkt ## 17, 18 and 19, are SEVERED from the present case and will be treated as separate

cases.

2. Plaintiff's fourth new proposed complaint will be opened as case no. 10-cv-337-slc.

Entered this 24th day of June, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge